

Rogers Promises Senators Will Get Foreign-Aid Data

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 8 — Secretary of State William P. Rogers promised today to provide Congress with long-range estimates of planned United States foreign aid after key senators threatened to block the Administration's request for funds for economic and military assistance this year.

In exchanges with members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. Rogers did not, however, reverse the Nixon Administration's policy in invoking executive privilege to refuse to submit specific documents to Congress.

This privilege was invoked on Aug. 31 after the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had voted to suspend all current military aid to foreign nations on Sept. 1 unless the Defense Department presented its five-year plan for overseas military assistance.

Without the formal invocation of executive privilege, the funds, would have been cut off under terms of the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act.

Today, Mr. Rogers assured

Continued on Page 10, Column 1

Senator William Proxmire, Democrat of Wisconsin, the subcommittee's chairman, and Senator Gale McGee, Democrat of Wyoming, who is also a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, that it would be "reasonable" for the Administration to supply congress with rough projections on economic and military aid in the next five years.

After Senator Proxmire said that he wanted "something we can use in committee, on the floor and make public," Secretary Rogers replied: "I think, Senator, 'We can comply with your request. I think it is reasonable.'"

The difference between the situation created by the request by Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for a Pentagon document on military aid and the request by the Proxmire subcommittee was that only "rough projections" were asked for today.

"I'm not asking for a confidential paper," Senator Proxmire said.

Would Hold Up Aid Bill

Both Senator Proxmire and Senator McGee told Mr. Rogers that the subcommittee would not authorize the 3.3-billion foreign economic and military aid bill, already approved by the House, unless the Administration submitted some information on plans for assistance over the next five years.

Senator McGee said that foreign assistance legislation would be "dead without it."

Mr. Rogers told the subcommittee that "I don't think this should result in a confrontation between the legislative and executive branches" and that "I think we ought to work out some kind of accommodation."

He cautioned, however, that neither the State Department nor the Agency for International Development had five-year projection of economic aid. He said that earlier attempts to project economic assistance over a long period had proved inaccurate.

\$1.21-Billion Arms Aid

This year's foreign aid program includes \$1.21-billion in military grants and credits. The figures for this are prepared by the Pentagon, and Senator Fulbright had insisted that a five-year projection for it exists. Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said there were only "working papers."

Mr. Rogers testified in support of the aid legislation. He argued that military aid was needed, especially in Asia and the Middle East, to make the recipient countries better able to defend themselves.

Concerning economic aid, he said that "with two-thirds of the world's people still living in less-developed countries, it is neither right or wise for the United States to diminish its commitment to development."

In his prepared statement, Mr. Rogers urged the Senators to restore funds for Greece and Pakistan that the House cut out last month.

"We regret the failure of the Greek regime to move more rapidly toward a return to representative government, and we have made our disappointment clear to the Greek Government on a number of occasions," he said. "Nevertheless, we believe strongly that United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization security interests warrant an assistance program for Greece at the level we have requested."

Mr. Rogers also said that "we have urged the Government of Pakistan to make every effort to create the conditions that will lead to the return of the refugees and will permit the resumption of an effective overall development program."

President vs. Congress

Nixon's Refusal to Furnish Data Deepens Constitutional Struggle

By MARJORIE HUNTER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 2 — By refusing this week to disclose long-range plans for foreign military aid, President Nixon has deepened the Constitutional struggle between the Presidency and the Congress.

He may also have jeopardized all or at least a large part, of the Foreign Military Assistance

bill, now pending in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This was implicit in a statement by Sen-

ator J. W. Fulbright, the committee chairman, scarcely an hour after he was formally notified that the President would not furnish the data.

"It is my personal view," the Senator said, "that the state of the American economy, and especially our balance-of-payments situation, makes it essential that the burden on the United States of outright gifts of military equipment and training to over 30 countries must be scrutinized most carefully this year."

"That scrutiny," he went on, "requires that the Congress have available to it the Administration projections for military assistance for the next few years—information which is not now to be forthcoming."

This was a thinly veiled reminder that by refusing to enact military assistance legislation or by threatening to slash it drastically, the Senate might still force the President's hand.

Series of Confrontations

Senator Fulbright is not alone in challenging the power of the White House. His committee's demand for information on military aid was merely the latest in a long line of confrontations.

Among them have been the following:

¶The Foreign Relations Committee has repeatedly demanded other documents — including a study of the Gulf of Tonkin incident and a Pentagon study of the Vietnam War. The Administration released some of the Pentagon study, but only after portions had appeared in The New York Times and other newspapers. It has not yet made available the Tonkin study.

¶Various committees have sought testimony from the President's national security adviser, Henry A. Kissinger. He has refused on the ground that he is a personal adviser to the President.

¶A Judiciary subcommittee, headed by Senator Sam J. Ervin, Democrat of North Carolina, is considering legislation that would compel Government officials to appear before Congressional committees for questioning, unless the President specifically ordered them not to appear.

¶Senator John Sherman Cooper, a Republican of Kentucky, has proposed that the Central Intelligence Agency furnish information to Congress, just as it does to the White House.

¶A bill to limit the war powers of the President has won unexpected support in Congress and could be enacted as part of the draft extension bill this fall.

These and other efforts to reassert the power of Congress as a co-equal branch of government have brought together usually diverse groups, Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals. Thus, it is entirely possible that some move to force the President to supply the data on foreign military aid could eventually succeed.

Sources within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee say that one lever could be refusal by the committee to send the military aid bill, approved by the House, to the Senate floor unless the information is supplied.

However, the sources say, it is more likely that the committee will choose first to make major reductions in the \$4-billion, two-year military aid bill, perhaps eliminating all or part of the \$390-million earmarked for Cambodia and reducing aid to countries with military regimes.

These sources say that the committee also is likely to crack down even harder than the House has on military aid to Greece.

The House voted to suspend aid to Greece, but coupled this with an "escape clause" allowing the President to provide such aid on the ground of "overriding requirements of the national security."

Any sizable reductions in military aid, or deletion of Presidential escape clauses, would be viewed as a severe blow to the Nixon doctrine.

For it is under this doctrine that the President has promised increased aid to a number of countries to strengthen their military forces so they might fight their own battles, thus eliminating or reducing the need for United States troops.

PRESIDENT DENIES ARMS-AID PLANS TO SENATE PANEL

**Invokes Executive Privilege
to Block Fulbright Group's
Bid to Halt Military Help**

By MARJORIE HUNTER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Aug. 31—President Nixon refused today to disclose to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the Administration's long-range plans for foreign military assistance.

With his action—the second time Mr. Nixon had invoked “executive privilege” to deny information to Congress—the President forestalled a threatened Congressional halt in all foreign military aid.

The Foreign Relations Committee voted, 15 to 0, on July 29 for suspension of all foreign military aid unless the Pentagon supplied its five-year plan for military assistance, or unless the President forbade making the information available.

Move Disclosed by Laird

The President's decision was announced in a memorandum made public late today by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, just hours before the deadline for supplying the information to the Senate committee.

In his memorandum, the President described the information being sought by the committee as “internal working documents” involving only “tentative planning data.”

“I have determined, therefore,” he said, “that it would not be in the public interest to provide to the Congress the basic planning data on military assistance” being sought by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary Laird had earlier denied the existence of such long-range plans within the Defense Department. In a letter Aug. 7 he told the committee that “we have no document or documents which constitute a current five-year plan for the military assistance program in the Department of Defense.”

Request Rejected

Therefore, he said, it was impossible to comply with the committee's request.

However, other Pentagon spokesmen had told Congress in recent months that such “internal staff documents” did exist—and it was information contained in these that the Foreign Relations Committee was seeking to obtain.

The President's decision to withhold the information was criticized late today by Senator J. W. Fulbright, the Foreign Relations Committee chairman. He said that by refusing to supply the documents, Mr. Nixon had made it difficult for his committee “to legislate in the area of foreign military assistance.”

Noting that the committee had requested the data strictly on a “confidential basis,” Senator Fulbright said he found the President's decision hard to understand “in the light of earlier statements about the desire of this Administration

to be open and forthcoming in its relations with the American people and Congress.”

In a memorandum to members of his Cabinet on March 24, 1969, shortly after he took office, the President said that “the policy of this Administration is to comply to the fullest extent possible with Congressional requests for information.”

He said that while there might be times when disclosure of certain information “would be incompatible with the public interest . . . this Administration will invoke this authority only in the most compelling circumstances and after a rigorous inquiry into the actual need for its exercise.”

In denying the foreign aid information to the committee, Mr. Nixon acted under what is called the doctrine of executive privilege, which has been used, but only sparingly, since George Washington's Presidency.

No Constitutional Provision

The Constitution nowhere refers expressly either to the power of Congress to obtain information or to the power of the executive to withhold information from Congress. However, both of these rights are rooted in history and precedent.

In threatening to halt foreign aid unless the Administration supplied the requested data or the President forbade its release, the Foreign Relations Committee acted under a pro-

vision of the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act.

That act stipulates that spending for a foreign aid activity will be suspended if, within 35 days, the executive branch has not supplied a document requested by Congress or unless the President forbids making the document available.

Siding with the committee, the Controller General of the United States, Elmer B. Staats, had ruled that foreign military aid funding would cease tomorrow unless the Administration complied.

The Controller General, whose General Accounting Office is the investigative watchdog agency of Congress, has authority to disallow disbursement of appropriated funds when he finds noncompliance with the law.

Nixon Stresses ‘Privacy’

In refusing to divulge the military assistance information, President Nixon expressed concern that “unless privacy of preliminary exchange of views between personnel of the executive branch can be maintained, the full frank and healthy expression of opinion which is essential for the successful administration of government would be muted.”

Assistant Attorney General William H. Rehnquist said today that he knew of only one other instance in which President Nixon had invoked executive privilege in withholding requested information from Congress.

That case, in June, 1970, involved a request by a House Government Operations sub-

committee, headed by Representative L. H. Fountain, Democrat of North Carolina, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation reports evaluating scientists nominated to serve on advisory boards for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

In refusing to divulge the contents of the F.B.I. report, Attorney General John P. Mitchell informed the subcommittee: “This invocation of privilege is being made without the specific approval of the President.”

While this is only the second time that the President has openly invoked executive privilege, there have been other instances in which the executive branch has denied information to Congress by refusing to allow key officials to testify or by refusing to supply requested documents.

In several instances—such as the Pentagon study of the Vietnam war and a study of the supersonic transport aircraft—the Administration supplied information many months, and in some cases several years, after Congress sought the data.

President Bars Senate Unit From Access to Aid Plans

By Michael Getler

Washington Post Staff Writer

President Nixon used the rarely invoked doctrine of executive privilege yesterday to prevent the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from finding out how much the Pentagon is planning to spend on foreign military aid over the next five years.

The President's action

averted a threatened cutoff of this year's \$1 billion foreign military aid package that would have taken effect today.

It also put the White House firmly behind Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird in the Pentagon chief's two-year battle with committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) over the right of the Executive Branch to withhold from Congress information which legis-

lators claim they need in their deliberations.

The Defense Department supplies foreign military aid to more than 30 nations. The program has taken on added expense and importance in the past two years. Under the Nixon Doctrine, the United States will supply increased aid to a number of countries to beef up their military forces on the theory that stronger allies able to fight their own battles will eliminate the need for the United States to get involved with its own troops.

On July 28, the Senate committee — including Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) — voted unanimously to invoke a little known provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. This would have shut off all foreign military aid funds unless the Pentagon supplied the planning documents that the committee had been trying to get or else the President invoked executive privilege and explained his reasons for doing so.

The committee action was subsequently upheld by the Comptroller General of the United States, Elmer B. Staats.

See PRIVILEGE, A5, Col. 1

PRIVILEGE, From A1

Laird had claimed that there were no "current five-year plans" in existence and that all the Pentagon had at this point were tentative and unapproved plans for future years submitted by U.S. military advisory groups abroad.

Fulbright contends that two years of correspondence with Laird on the subject and testimony this year by other Pentagon officials before Congress have shown that such a long-range plan does exist.

In a memorandum to both Laird and Secretary of State William P. Rogers that was written Monday and released by the Pentagon yesterday, the President directed that no material be provided to the committee and explained why he had chosen to invoke executive privilege.

The President echoed Laird's point, claiming that "the basic planning data and the various internal staff papers requested by the committee do not, insofar as they deal with future years, reflect any approved program of this administration, for no approved program for military assistance beyond the current fiscal year exists."

The President said the basic plans that do exist "reflect only tentative intermediate staff level thinking" and he stressed that unless privacy can be maintained in exchange of these preliminary views "the successful administration of government would be muted."

Fulbright expressed regret over the President's action yesterday, claiming he found it "hard to understand, especially since the information was requested on a classified basis and in light of earlier statements about the desire of this administration to be open and forthcoming in its rela-

tions with the American people and Congress."

Since taking office, the President has invoked executive privilege only once before — in June 1970 in support of a Justice Department refusal to supply some FBI files to Rep. L. H. Fountain (D-N.C.).

While the President's action removes the threat that this year's military foreign aid measure will be blocked, some Capitol Hill sources say the move could lead to cuts in the fiscal 1972 request by adding to congressional concern over a number of related issues.

These include the shipment of arms to Pakistan, the effect of the President's new policy toward mainland China in terms of continued arms aid for Taiwan and the effect on the balance of payments problem in light of the new Nixon economic package.

Ironically, both the President and Sen. Fulbright cited a presidential memo of March 24, 1969, in defense of their respective positions yesterday.

That memo directed the heads of departments and agencies "to comply to the fullest extent possible with congressional requests for information." It also said that "this administration will invoke executive privilege to withhold information only in the most compelling circumstances and only after a rigorous inquiry into the actual need for its exercise."

The President said he had conducted such an inquiry over the foreign aid request and found it "not in the public interest" to provide this preliminary data to the Congress.

Defense officials have privately contended that information sometimes leaks from Congress and that widespread knowledge of the individual nations' funding levels would cause dissension among them.

Report on Executive 'Arrogance'

Fulbright Renews Demand To Monitor U.S. Spending

By George Lardner Jr.
Washington Post Staff Writer

Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) renewed his drive yesterday for legislation invoking the power of the purse against government agencies that withhold information from Congress.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman was especially critical of "delaying tactics" encountered by the General Accounting Office in efforts to monitor overseas spending by the State Department and the Pentagon.

"Congress must act to end this arrogance by the executive branch," Fulbright said in releasing a 34-page report on sometimes outright but more often "de facto" denials of information sought by GAO auditors over the past two years.

In one case, after a 13-month delay, the GAO reported, the State Department denied it the right to conduct a review for Congress of U.S. occupation costs in Berlin. Twice, the agency said, "we were denied the right to visit U.S.-supported military bases in Vietnam." On another occasion, the report said, the Pentagon even sought to classify its refusal to supply a document involving spending on troops from Thailand.

Fulbright described the report from the GAO, which

Congress set up as its watchdog over government spending, as clear documentation of the need for remedial legislation. Under a bill he has introduced, funds would be cut off from the agency concerned until information requested by a congressional committee or by the GAO is produced or until executive privilege is invoked by the President.

The proposal is patterned after a 1961 law providing for a cutoff of foreign aid funds under similar conditions. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted unanimously July 28 to invoke this measure in an effort to secure the Pentagon's plans for foreign military aid over the next five years.

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird replied that no current five-year plan existed, but the head of the GAO, Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats, ruled that the administration's \$1 billion foreign military aid package would be stymied unless the plans were produced or the White House stepped in.

President Nixon invoked executive privilege, a step he has taken only once before in a memo written before the cutoff was to take effect. The 1961 law provides a 35-day

deadline. The across-the-board measure proposed by Fulbright would impose a 70-day deadline.

The new GAO report, Fulbright noted yesterday, cites a June 18, 1971, directive from U.S. European Command headquarters listing the type of documents that chiefs of Military Assistance Advisory Groups missions were not to release to the GAO without "approval from higher authority."

Said Fulbright: "Prominent on the list was 'The Military Assistance Five-Year Plan for a particular country . . . the type of plan which the Department of Defense recently told the Committee did not exist.'"

In its report, the GAO said that enabling legislation passed in 1921, supported by repeated expressions of intent by congressional committees, "leaves no doubt but that Congress and GAO are expected to have access to all records, documents, or papers necessary to effectively evaluate the various programs of the executive branch. It called absolute denials of information a rarity in recent years, but said repeated delays amounting to a "de facto denial" are often encountered.

A Bit Too Late

In one case, the GAO said, its Far East branch asked the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Thailand for various message logs. The request was made on July 30, 1970, but bounced back and forth between Bangkok and Washington until Nov. 4, 1970, when the Defense Department gave qualified approval. "However," the report noted, "by this point in time, the GAO audit staff had left the audit site where the logs were located."

Even more frustration, the GAO said, was encountered in its efforts to review U.S. occupation costs in Berlin, a study designed to determine whether the Federal Republic of Germany was paying its proper share.

The GAO said it notified U.S. officials in Berlin of its plans in February, 1970, and emphasized that it would limit itself to records available in U.S. agencies there.

U.S. Army officials, the report said, voiced no objections, but a U.S. embassy official expressed reservations about the Berlin agreement's permitting a single-power audit. The GAO formally asked the State Department in May, 1970, for access to the records it wanted. After letters, telephone calls and meetings, the report said, the request was denied in March, 1971.

"In denying us access," the GAO said, "the response by the Department of State made no reference to invoking executive privilege; the Department of State does not have authority to deny us the right to examine the records or conduct the review."

Cambodia, Laos Aid Cut Urged

Senators expressing alarm over reports of an expanded U.S. military presence in Cambodia and anxious to limit military spending in Laos will press this week for restricting amendments to pending foreign aid and military procurement legislation.

Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) will offer an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act today to place a ceiling on the number of Americans who can be assigned to that country.

And Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) will seek Senate approval of his proposed arms bill amendment putting a lid of \$200 million on arms appropriations in Laos, less than half the Pentagon's planned figure of \$490 million.

Case's amendment would limit the U.S. involvement to 100 military personnel and 50 civilians.

There are currently 50 military men assigned to the military equipment delivery team that handles the steadily increasing flow of U.S. arms aid into Cambodia.

There are also 10 Marine guards assigned to the U.S. embassy in Phnom Penh and 24 other servicemen with the U.S. military attache's office.

There are now 47 civilians assigned to the U.S. embassy.

"We have made the Cambodian government almost totally dependent on us through our economic and military assistance," the senator said, "and we are providing massive air support."

Case said that the United States "should go no further—at least without a firm decision by the Congress and the American people."

The U.S. military aid program in the country has increased this year to \$200 million, and Case reports that when the delivery team level was increased to 50 men in July, the Pentagon had actually requested an increase to 100.

If Case's amendment is approved as expected by the Foreign Relations Committee, it will become part of the foreign aid bill that goes to the Senate floor later this month. It will thus take a floor amendment by opponents of the restriction to get it out of the final bill.

The Defense Department has explained its increased presence in Cambodia as necessary to insure proper use and handling of the steadily increasing flow of military hardware into the country.

Symington argued in a speech prepared for floor debate today on the arms bill that "any American policy in Laos which costs more than \$200 million to support is too expensive or too dangerous or both."

Deploring what he called the "continuing and growing American involvement" in Laos, Symington said the actual spending in that country has proved repeatedly to be higher than budgetary totals indicated. He said it appeared that only Congress could contain the U.S. activity through budget restrictions.

Senate Unit Limits Aid To Vietnam

By Spencer Rich

Washington Post Staff Writer

Completing action on a \$3.2 billion foreign aid bill yesterday, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted 11 to 5 to cut off all funds for U.S. military operations in Indochina, except for money needed to achieve total withdrawal of U.S. forces.

The fund cutoff, sponsored by Sens. Frank Church (D-Idaho) and John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.), was one of two end-the-war amendments locked into the President's foreign aid authorization request by the committee yesterday. Also approved, 12 to 4, was a new version of Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield's amendment calling for withdrawal of all U.S. forces within six months of enactment of the bill.

Addition of the two amendments assures a new and bitter Senate struggle over the Indochina war issue in the waning months of the session. At administration insistence, the House forced an earlier Mansfield amendment out of the draft bill in conference; another, passed by the Senate 57 to 38, could suffer the same fate in the just-started House-Senate conference on the military procurement bill.

Before the final foreign aid bill was approved by the committee, Republicans led by Jacob K. Javits (N.Y.) and Minority Leader Hugh Scott (Pa.), engineered a reversal of \$375 million in budget cuts previously voted by the committee. As a result, the final bill is only \$350 million below the administration's \$3.547 billion request, instead of nearly \$725 million below.

The \$375 million addition involved insertion of special separate authorizations of \$125 million for population control and \$250 million for relief for Pakistani refugees, instead of requiring money for these purposes to be taken out of other funds in the bill.

The Republicans also forced reversal of a tentative committee decision to fund the economic aid programs for one year only. As a result, the bill carries two-year authorizations for the economic aid portions of the program, but not the military. These changes were achieved with the aid of a proxy which Scott reportedly obtained Monday from Sen. Karl E. Mundt (R-S.D.), who suffered a stroke in November, 1969, and has not appeared on the Senate floor or at a committee meeting since.

Other key provisions of the reported bill provide \$459 million in foreign military credit sales authority—a cut of only 10 per cent despite Democratic attempts to slash it further—of which it is estimated as much as \$300 million may go to Israel, and a limit of \$250 million on total outlays of all types for Cambodia, in order to limit expansion of U.S. participation there.

Effective upon enactment, the Cooper-Church amendment bars all funds for U.S. military operations in North and South Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos except for the purpose of totally withdrawing all U.S. forces.

Both Church and Cooper said that while the President would obviously have some amount of discretion on what kinds of actions are needed to protect U.S. forces while withdrawing and could respond to immediate and pressing military threats in various ways, their amendment is designed to bar major operations such as the 1970 attack on Cambodia "sanctuaries" or the later operation against Laos.

They said it also would bar U.S. bombing and strafing for the purpose of supporting the Cambodian and Laotian governments, though not bombing for interdiction of the Ho Chi Minh trail in southern Laos and similar areas.

The amendment does not tie U.S. withdrawal either to the release of U.S. prisoners—which Cooper said can be achieved only after we agree to get out—nor to the achievement of a South Vietnamese capacity to defend itself.

The amendment doesn't set any final date for completion of withdrawal—a potential loophole allowing U.S. troops to stay longer than the bare logistical requirements might entail.

Church said he assumed that if the President signed the amendment, he would abide by its spirit. Aides to several senators who voted for the amendment said Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird and other military spokesmen had said repeatedly that six months would be needed for the completion of withdrawal, once started, so any delay much beyond that period would be a signal for Congress to press the President on why he hadn't completed withdrawal.

In this context, the Cooper-Church amendment, which is a fund cutoff and legally binding, and the Mansfield amendment, which has a specific date but is primarily a sense-of-Congress statement and not legally binding, according to Mansfield, are complementary.

SENATE UNIT MAPS NEW CURB ON WAR

Proposal Says Funds Can
Be Used Only for Pullout

By JOHN W. FINNEY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Oct. 20.—The Senate Foreign Relations Committee today tried a new legislative approach to end the Vietnam war by approving an amendment specifying that the President can use funds only for an "expeditious" withdrawal of all forces from Indochina.

The amendment, which the committee attached to the foreign aid authorization bill, also states that American forces could not engage in further hostilities in Indochina except to protect themselves against "imminent danger" as they withdrew.

The amendment was sponsored by Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, and Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, and adopted by a vote of 11 to 5. Voting against the amendment were Senators John J. Sparkman, Democrat of Alabama; Gale W. McGee, Democrat of Wyoming; Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, Republican leader of the Senate; James B. Pearson, Republican of Kansas, and Karl E. Mundt, Republican of South Dakota.

The committee also adopted, by a 12-4 vote, a troop-withdrawal amendment by the Senate majority leader, Mike Mansfield, that the Senate had attached to the military procurement authorization bill. The Mansfield amendment, which the House indirectly refused to accept yesterday by a 215-193 vote, would establish as "policy of the United States" that all American troops would be withdrawn from Indochina in six months, provided only that all American prisoners of war were released by that time.

Seen as Alternative

The Cooper-Church amendment was intended as an alternative to the Mansfield amendment, which now seems likely to be scrapped by the Senate. House conference committee on the military procurement bill. The immediate indications were that the Cooper-Church amendment would be opposed as strenuously by the Administration as was the Mansfield amendment.

The initial reaction of Senator Scott, presumably reflecting White House views, was that the Cooper-Church amendment would have a "disastrous impact" and "cause considerable confusion at the military level as to what constitutes action to protect troops as they are withdrawn."

The Cooper-church amendment states that funds appropriated for the military "may be used only for the purpose of withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Indochina and may not be used for the purpose of engaging U.S. military forces in hostilities in North or South Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos, except for actions necessary to protect said forces against imminent danger."

While not explicitly stated, the implication of the amendment is that the President could not use any funds to maintain a residual force in Indochina or make the withdrawal timetable contingent on the survival of the Saigon Government.

'Without Congressional Authority

The underlying legal premise of the amendment, as stated in its preamble, is that with the repeal last year of the 1964 Tonkin Gulf resolution the President is "without Congressional authority for continued participation in the war in Indochina" and his only Constitutional authority as Commander in Chief is to protect the troops as they are withdrawn.

As interpreted by its sponsors, the Cooper-Church amendment would declare it to be "the policy of the United States to provide for the expeditious withdrawal from Indochina of all United States military forces." To enforce this policy, it would provide that funds could be used only for troop withdrawals.

Under the amendment, for example, the United States could not provide combat air support to Cambodian or Laotian troops and in Vietnam American forces could not engage in combat except to protect themselves against "imminent danger." As defined by Senator Cooper, "imminent danger" would be a situation in which American troops were faced "in a limited, specific way" with an attack that threatens their destruction.

The Cooper-Church amendment contains no deadline for "expeditious withdrawal," and thus presumably the White House could argue that the amendment was not in conflict with the Administration's declared goal of total withdrawal.

DEBATE IS BITTER

Rebuff to Program Is First Since Marshall Plan Began in '48

By FELIX BELAIR Jr.
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Oct. 29—The Senate, in a stunning surprise, rejected the Nixon Administration's foreign aid authorization bill today by a vote of 41 to 27.

It was the first time since the beginning of the Marshall Plan in 1948 that the Senate had refused to pass in some form a foreign aid measure requested by an Administration.

The unexpected defeat came when a coalition developed between fiscal conservatives who had long opposed foreign assistance and liberals who had become disenchanted with foreign aid. Between them they supplied the margin of defeat.

To a certain extent the outcome was influenced by Senators who had left town before the vote. Even if all 38 absentees had voted, however, it was regarded as far from certain that they could have changed the outcome.

Once Backers, Now Opponents

The liberals, who in years past had been the principal defenders of the foreign aid program today became its principal opponents. Among those voting against the bill were Senators Mike Mansfield, the majority leader; J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, who before the vote delivered a speech entitled, "Farewell to Foreign Aid, a Liberal Takes Leave."

Contributing to the defeat, in the opinion of some officials, was the lack of any strong pressure or support from the White House. In fact, the officials believe the White House may have contributed to the Senate rejection by approving statements criticizing nations

that had voted against the United States in the United Nations on the China issue.

Some Senators voted against the bill in anticipation that a continuing resolution authorizing further foreign aid expenditures would be passed or on the theory that A.I.D., with nearly \$5-billion in the pipeline from past appropriations, had enough to carry on until a new program could be developed.

New Action Held Dubious

In view of the vote, it was held doubtful that a continuing resolution—which authorizes expenditures at last year's rate—could be pushed through the Senate.

While the House has passed an authorization bill, there can be no Senate-House conference on the issue, inasmuch as the Senate would have no bill to take into such a meeting.

The bill requested by the Administration would have au-

thorized the expenditure of \$3.3-billion in economic and military aid in the fiscal year that began last July 1. The House of Representatives had cut the request to \$3.2-billion and sent it in September.

In the final Senate tally, 26 Democrats and 15 Republicans joined to defeat the bill, while 19 Republicans and 8 Democrats voted to approve it.

\$143-Billion Expended

After the final vote, the majority leader, Mike Mansfield of Montana, told the Senate: "What the Senate has done in its wisdom is possibly mark the end of the foreign aid program as initiated after World War II in the Marshall Plan."

He noted that about \$143-billion had been spent on foreign assistance in the postwar period. Noting that several billion dollars remain "in the pipeline," he said the program would "not die suddenly but very likely die a lingering death."

The majority leader said he hoped there would be no procedural resolution merely continuing the program at the level of last year's expenditures.

He said that "this is a clear signal separate and apart from the United Nations action on Monday" and that it was time to put into operation "a new foreign aid concept" that will take the burden off the United States, distribute it more equitably among nations and eliminate the "grab bag" concept of the aid bill.

"Perhaps this is part of the changing situation in the world in the early seventies," he continued. "Perhaps it is time to develop new ideas and get away from old ideas."

The end of the authorizing legislation, as far as the Senate is concerned, came after 10 hours of sometimes embittered debate during which Adminis-

tration's supporters managed to hold cuts in the bill to \$288-million.

Slash in Military Aid

These included reductions of \$113-million in military assistance grants and \$175-million in economic-development loans and grants to help less developed countries.

The United Nations had come in for criticism during the debate. This was represented in amendments requiring separate Congressional authorization of the annual United States assessment for running expenses and recommending that the President try to negotiate a downward revision of that assessment to 25 per cent of the total.

The heaviest blow to the Administration's hopes, until the final vote, came on a 43-to-36 vote that would cut the development loan funds of the Agency for International Development by the 50 per cent to a total of \$160-million. The Administration had requested \$400-million and the Foreign Relations Committee recommended \$320-million.

Moments after the vote on development funds the Senate shouted through a proposal by two Republican Senators, Barry Goldwater of Arizona and Theodore Stevens of Alaska, more than doubling the cost of loans to less developed countries. It would require that interest rates be no less than that on Treasury borrowing to provide the money.

The Agency for International Development has been making 40-year loans at 2 per cent in the first 10 years and 3 per cent thereafter; the rate on comparable Treasury securities runs from 6 to 8 per cent.

Aid to Cambodia Backed

Earlier in the day the Senate voted, 45 to 36, to approve the restoration of \$91-million asked by the Administration for economic and military aid to Cambodia. The action raised the ceiling on such aid from \$250-million, recommended by the committee, to \$341-million.

One of the few surprises of the day came on a 49-to-31 vote that struck from the bill a ban of economic or military aid to Greece. Economic aid to that country was discontinued several years ago but the meas-

ure provided \$118-million of military aid, including "excess" weapons and equipment, and \$60-million for F-4 fighter planes and "supporting" facilities.

The Foreign Relations Committee had adopted the language of the House-approved ban, which included a proviso that the President could find that "overriding considerations of the national defense" required a waiver the ban and reported his finding to Congress.

In the debate on the amendment to delete the ban, Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, argued that "the continued repression of human rights in Greece weakens the North Atlantic Treaty alliance" rather than strengthening it.

Full Nuclear Test Ban Sought

U.S. Shift on On-Site Inspection Urged

By Thomas O'Toole
Washington Post Staff Writer

A Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee yesterday called on the Nixon administration to give up its demand for on-site inspections in the Soviet Union as a condition for a ban on the underground testing of atomic weapons.

"The time has come for the administration to take positive action toward negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty," said Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), chairman of the Subcommittee on Arms Control. "The President should personally review the U.S. position and take the necessary initiatives to move us toward the goal he has endorsed—a complete nuclear test ban."

In a nine page report released yesterday by the eight-man subcommittee, on-site inspection was called the most lingering obstacle to a complete halt to nuclear testing.

"The possibilities of movement toward a comprehensive test ban," the subcommittee report said, "have always

founded on the question of on-site inspection."

Conceding that inspection of test sites would create an inhibition against treaty violations, the subcommittee questioned the importance or necessity of on-site inspections.

"On-site inspection is of no help in explaining events that ... cannot be detected or located," the subcommittee said, "and it is not necessary for events at the higher end of the range because seismic means should be adequate."

Possibly the strongest reason for dropping on-site inspection demands, the subcommittee went on, is the "enormous advances" made in seismic detection of underground tests from anywhere in the world.

In the eight years since the signing of the treaty banning tests in the atmosphere, the Senate group said, seismic technology has grown to the point where tests down to six kilotons can be detected in hard rock.

The subcommittee added that "it is now possible to de-

ploy a new seismic network" which could detect tests down to 1.5 kilotons in hard rock. The main drawback to deployment of this network, the subcommittee said, is that it would cost about \$200 million.

"This cost seems insignificant," the subcommittee concluded, "when compared to the amounts spent on arms and on the value derived from a comprehensive test ban."

While admitting that an underground test ban based on seismic detection could never hope to catch all attempts to evade it, the subcommittee insisted that it would be enough to trap evasions of any military significance.

"It would seem that a test ban resting on seismic verification alone," the Senate report said, "would provide a high degree of assurance that high yield violations were not occurring, a defensible objective in itself."

The Muskie subcommittee said that a major impediment to a complete test ban was the possible continuation of peace-

ful nuclear explosion programs in the Soviet Union.

"Since it would be possible to pursue weapons development in conjunction with a peaceful nuclear explosives program," the report said, "it must be recognized that the possibilities of evasion through these means are at least as serious as the problems inherent in seismic verification."

To get around this obstacle, the subcommittee called for supervision of peaceful explosions by the International Atomic Energy Agency as a small price to pay for fulfillment of a complete test ban.

CONGRESS CHIEFS AGREE FOREIGN AID SHOULD CONTINUE

But Differences Are Wide
on Duration and Scope
of Any Extension

AIM IS STOPGAP ACTION

Senate Group Plans 30-Day
Measure to Be Followed
by an Interim Program

By FELIX BELAIR Jr.

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 1 — Congressional leaders agreed today that the foreign aid program should have a new lease on life, but there were wide differences about the duration and scope of any extension as well as the shape of any permanent legislation to follow.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee agreed in closed session that the aid program should be continued beyond Nov. 15, the date when the current spending authority is scheduled to expire.

While no votes were taken today and no formal decisions were made, members said an effort would be made to extend the authority for 30 days. During that time, they said, the panel will try to agree on an "interim" program pending development of a new kind of program during next year's session.

'Quickie Stopgap' Move

This conformed to a proposal by Representative George H. Mahon of Texas, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, to seek approval of what he described as a "quickie stopgap" measure extending aid operations for 30 days while some compromise is being

worked out. Mr. Mahon was supported in this by Speaker Carl Albert of Oklahoma, who said such a measure could be brought before the House in a few days or early next week.

Mr. Mahon's proposal would permit continued operation of the economic and military aid programs at the \$2.9-billion annual level that the Senate had agreed to just before its unexpected vote Friday night to kill the new authorizing legislation, 41 to 27.

Some Senate committeemen talked about limiting any 30-day extension resolution to administrative and operating expenses to avoid hardship to overseas and domestic employees of the Agency for International Development.

The State Department said, in

this regard, that 4,126 employees of the agency would go off the payroll on Nov. 15 unless an extension was voted.

Charles W. Bray 3d, the State Department spokesman, said that with their departure the foreign-aid system would come to a halt regardless of the amount of unspent aid funds left in the pipeline. The State Department has put this figure at \$3.4-billion, of which \$3-billion is said to have been committed.

Senators also spoke favorably today of including funds for Pakistani refugees and for military assistance to Israel while provisions of separate "interim" legislation were being worked out. This measure would be submitted to the Senate before adjournment of this session.

Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said after its 90-minute meeting, "I think one thing I can say is that there wasn't any disposition to do nothing." He added:

"Something will be done but what it will be, I have no idea. As they say downtown, I want to leave my options open."

Meanwhile, the Administration stepped up its campaign to get a 90-day extension resolution through both legislative branches with authority to continue the \$2.64-billion spending ~~rate~~ approved in last year's appropriation. At the White House and the State and Defense Departments, spokesmen took a noticeably harder line

against "piecemeal" legislation such as members of the Foreign Relations Committee were considering.

President Nixon conferred during the day with Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird and with Henry A. Kissinger, the Presidential assistant for national security. Mr. Nixon also scheduled a meeting with Secretary of State William P. Rogers for tomorrow.

Revival Program Urged

After the President's meeting with Mr. Kissinger, Ronald L. Ziegler, the White House press secretary, told newsmen that revival of a "balanced, integrated and coordinated foreign-aid program" was necessary to avoid weakening the President's ability to negotiate with China and the Soviet Union.

"It is important at this time in history when we are moving toward an era of negotiation which those countries that we cannot and should not dilute the incentive of those negotiating by ending foreign assistance," Mr. Ziegler said.

Senator Fulbright had said that, to him, "the critical issue is the military side of foreign aid," particularly such items as an increase in aid to Cambodia, which would have received up to \$341-million under the defeated Senate measure.

Evidently aware of this, Mr. Ziegler said at a late White House briefing that what he gave as the President's position program. "A coordinate foreign-

aid program must include military assistance," he said.

Secretary Laird suggested on leaving the President's office that an end of military aid could have a direct effect on United States plans to continue withdrawing troops from South Vietnam and South Korea. He said it also bore directly on efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to negotiate with the Warsaw Pact countries for mutual reductions of troops in Europe.

The Secretary's spokesman at the Pentagon, Jerry W. Friedheim, said that "we would not like to be in a position where we would have to leave men overseas that we had intended to bring home."

Mr. Laird said that the abrupt ending of military aid "could not have come at a worse time, as the Administration is trying to move from confrontation to negotiation."

The Defense Secretary who is leaving this week on a tour of Asian capitals, said, "I am going to assure the Vietnamese that the Senate's action on the aid bill is not final and that corrective action will be taken."

Senator Fulbright said that if there was a consensus in his committee on anything it was that "we should take advantage of this opportunity to work some revisions in the program including a number of things that reflect attitudes formed during the cold war."

Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, the Republican leader, said he favored a clear line of demarcation between economic and military aid programs even if both are to be retained in this bill as in the past.

Both Senator Fulbright and Senator Frank Church, democrat of Idaho, indicated they would resist any effort to include in interim legislation provision for economic and military aid to Cambodia for which the rejected Senate measure provided \$341-million.

Senator Fulbright said he planned to invite Secretary Rogers and Dr. John A. Hannah, A.I.D. administrator, to testify before the committee in the next few days.

Hill Acts To Keep Aid Alive

Laird Warns Viet Program Is Imperiled

By Spencer Rich
and Carroll Kilpatrick
Washington Post Staff Writers

Efforts to keep the foreign aid program alive got under way on both sides of Capitol Hill yesterday, amid warnings from Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird that a cutoff of economic aid to South Vietnam could imperil the Vietnamization effort to make Saigon militarily self-reliant.

In the House, Appropriations Committee Chairman George Mahon (D-Tex.) announced that a measure extending the present emergency financing for the foreign aid program for 30 days to Dec. 15 will be reported out of his committee next week with a spending level of about \$2.8 billion.

It will be packaged in a single continuing resolution also extending emergency financing for the Defense Department and District of Columbia, two other entities whose regular appropriations have not yet cleared Congress.

In the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee met and agreed informally to try to work out some new compromise foreign aid program in place of the one rejected by a 41 to 27 vote of the Senate Friday night.

Many of the Committee members — including Chairman J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) — voted against the bill because they oppose a buildup of military equipment aid to Cambodia or consider the present bilateral (country-to-country) form of aid an instrument of the cold war, designed to "buy" the friendship of nations ringing China and the Soviet Union.

"I guess it's safe to say something will be done," said Fulbright. "If there was any consensus, and that was limited, it was to take advantage of the situation to work for revision of the program."

Fulbright said Secretary of State William P. Rogers and Administrator John A. Hanan of the Agency for International Development will be invited to discuss possible new

approaches to the legislation at a closed but informal committee session later this week. Administration sources said later that it is believed Rogers may be available for the meeting on Wednesday.

The key question—in both chambers and in the White House—is how much the administration is going to have to give up in order to get an aid bill through the Senate. Administration spokesmen took an extremely hard line yesterday, insisting they want the whole \$3.6 billion administration package, or at very least, a continuing resolution that will carry the program forward at a somewhat lower level well into next session of Congress while the committee tries to work out some new program.

White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler told reporters the administration feels it "essential" to keep the existing program intact, and not dismantle it by passing only a few of the more popular programs, as suggested by Fulbright, Frank Church (D-Idaho) and other senators.

Laird, who met with the President for over an hour yesterday in preparation for a trip to Vietnam this week, told reporters afterwards, "The investment of our military assistance dollars is vital to the success of the (U.S.) troop reduction programs" in Vietnam and throughout Asia.

The aid bill killed by the Senate last Friday carried \$565 million in war-related economic assistance for South Vietnam, over \$300 million for military equipment and economic aid to Cambodia, \$90 million in war-related economic aid to Laos and Thailand and about \$424 million in economic and military equipment aid for Korea.

Laird said, "The success of the American withdrawal action in Vietnam and in the whole negotiating field will be affected by such action. This is not the time to end the aid program."

Laird said that by cutting off the military and economic aid programs for parts of Southeast Asia, and the military credit sales program, which goes to all parts of the world, defeat of the bill could imperil not only the Vietnamization program but the strategic arms talks. "This is not the time to show weakness," he said.

If it cannot get passage of its full \$3.6 billion aid bill, the administration would like Congress to pass a continuing resolution carrying the program forward for three months at the \$3.1 billion level of the past year, according to a State Department memo distributed yesterday. That would bring the expiration date from Nov. 15—when the current continuing resolution expires—to Feb. 15, leaving plenty of time to try to work out compromises and/or drum up new support to reverse the 41-to-27 defeat.

The memo says that if Congress wants a new approach, it might want to take another look at an administration proposal of last April 21, calling for splitting the military aid programs into a separate bill from the economic ones.

Several of the President's advisers, it was learned, have suggested he go on nationwide television with a public appeal for continuation of the aid program.

Chairman Mahon said yes-

terday that the continuing resolution he will report out next week will go to Dec. 15 or to the end of the current session. As for a 90-day extension, "We're not going to have that. Period. I'm handling the bill. Not beyond adjournment."

If the Senate has not worked up a new bill by Dec. 15, he might then take another look at the situation, Mahon said.

Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) has said he would oppose any continuing resolution. When asked yesterday about one that goes only for 30 days, he said, "It's debatable"—meaning it could be filibustered. The price of letting it go, presumably, would be for the administration to make concessions sought by Fulbright, Mansfield and other aid critics.

THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE 5 Nov 74

PAGE 1

U.S. Aid Revived As 2 Bills

Senate Panel Cuts Amount By \$1.2 Billion

By Spencer Rich
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted unanimously yesterday to revive foreign aid, but only after splitting it into two separate economic and military assistance bills and slashing more than \$1.2 billion from President Nixon's \$3.6 billion request for this year.

The two bills, totalling \$2.329 billion in authorizations, are intended as an "interim" substitute for the \$2.9 billion measure rejected by the Senate Friday by a 41 to 27 vote.

White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler told reporters immediately after the committee action, "We are not satisfied with that level. It is not sufficient to meet the essential elements of the President's policy." He added, "You may quote the President" that the \$2.329 billion figure "is insufficient."

Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) told reporters that he believed the committee had reported out the best bills it could, given the deep disagreements within it over the aid program.

But he said he would offer floor amendments to raise the total, although not all the way to \$2.9 billion again, because that would simply risk another rejection of the program by the Senate. He said he believed he could count on

enough vote switches to pass the two measures if their total added up to somewhere between \$2.329 billion and \$2.9 billion.

The two bills reported out yesterday:

- A \$1.144 billion economic and humanitarian aid authorization. This includes \$250 million for development loans, \$175 million for technical assistance, \$225 million for the Alliance for Progress, \$250 million for Pakistan refugee relief and \$139 million for the United Nations.

- A \$1.185 billion military aid authorization, which includes \$350 million for military aid grants, \$435 million for war-related economic supporting assistance (of which \$85 million is earmarked for Israel) and \$400 million for foreign military credit sales (with \$300 million in arms credit authority earmarked for Israel). The biggest cuts were in this area.

An unusual feature of committee voting was the use by Scott of a proxy from Karl E. Mundt (R-S.D.), who has been absent from the Senate for two years because of illness and has never appeared on the floor during that period. Mundt's proxy was decisive in an 8-to-7 committee vote to package humanitarian and economic aid together, instead of leaving them separate and having a total of three bills.

The military bill contains a \$341 million ceiling on aid to Cambodia, which the administration has now said it will accept, after threatening a veto of the earlier aid measure over an identical provision. Although it is only seeking \$341 million in funds for Cambodia aid, it had opposed a ceiling in case it wanted to switch more for emergency reasons.

State Department spokesman Charles Bray said yesterday, in the first such assurance yet given by the administration, that Cambodia aid programs "have come close to their peak and will be declining." The \$341 million ceiling was designed to head off a suspected increase.

Other important provisions approved by the committee operations in Cambodia; require annual authorization for basic State Department ex-

penses; bar use of U.S. funds for outside mercenaries to fight in North Vietnam, Thailand or Laos (thus wiping out a CIA program of financing Thai "volunteers" in Northern Laos). Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield's end-the-war-in-six-months amendment also is in the bill.

Despite committee approval, the aid program still faces serious obstacles. Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) and some other former aid supporters who voted against the bill on the floor last Friday still have serious reservations about the use of military assistance as a tool to "bribe" potential allies and still fear that aid to Cambodia may lead to deeper U.S. involvement and a long-term financial drain.

Traditional foes of high foreign spending may not be fully assuaged by the committee's big slashes.

In the House, which has already passed a \$3.4 billion authorization bill, the whole issue will have to come to the floor again. Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Thomas E. Morgan (D-Pa.) said yesterday it will be hard to get both bills through the House separ-

ately, since economic aid has always piggybacked to passage on the shoulders of military aid.

Even if the authorizations pass both chambers the program could face new cuts in the appropriations committees. Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Allan J. Ellender (D-La.) said yesterday he couldn't envision his committee voting out more than \$2 billion to \$2.2 billion in actual appropriations.

Before taking final action yesterday, the committee defeated, 10 to 6, a proposal by Sens. Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.), Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) and John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.) to approve a flat \$2.4 billion in a single bill, and include language barring any funds in the bill from being used for Cambodia and Laos except for the purpose of assisting in withdrawal of U.S. forces from Indochina.

Javits told reporters before the meeting that he would seek a \$2.9 billion authorization, but Case said the three shaved the figure to \$2.4 billion when it became clear that the higher figure had no chance.

Fulbright and the bulk of Committee Democrats opposed the Javits-Case-Cooper proposal because they favored a three-bill approach — seeking to have each of the separate portions of the program fly on its own — and a lower total figure, \$2.065 billion.

The committee first voted 9 to 7 for a three-bill system, then voted 8 to 7 to join economic and humanitarian aid. It went down each separate item in the two final bills, and Republicans won enough increases to push the final two-bill total to \$2.329 billion. Scott

said he favored a single package for fear military or economic aid portions might be defeated if sent to the floor alone, in a three-bill system.

Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard, in a statement yesterday, blasted defeat of the earlier bill, saying (in a reference to Fulbright) that he hoped it didn't indicate a

desire to return to "Fortress Kansas."

Scott tried to link the bill's failure to any possible slowing down of U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, but in emphasizing the need for military aid to U.S. allies, said the U.S. Navy would have to pull out of the Mediterranean without the support of Greece and Turkey.